UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/704,073	11/01/2000	Ludovic Hauduc	06576.105030-MS No. 15466	3930

			EXAMINER
20786	7590	06/07/2004	LIN, WEN TAI

KING & SPALDING LLP
191 PEACHTREE STREET, N.E.
ATLANTA, GA 30303-1763

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

> A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
> - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
> - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
> - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _01 November 2000_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-10_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-10_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _11/1/2000_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-10 are presented for examination.

2.   Claims 1-3 are objected to because the phrase "the language pack software

modules" in claim 1 appears to lack antecedent basis.

3.   Claims 9 are objected to because the word "to" in the clause containing " ...

content to for rendering ..." in claim 9 appears to be redundant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as
> set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented
> and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Furst [U.S. Pat. No. 6297819] in view of Begley et al.(hereafter

"Begley")[U.S. Pat. No. 6360246].

6.   As to claims 1 and 3, Furst teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a method for receiving an application with supplemental script content in a desired language from a server comprising the steps of:

- using a client to access the application on the server [col.2, lines 5 –30];

- determining a language preference for the client;

- converting the content of the application on the server to the client's language preference by using the selected language pack software module on the server corresponding to the client's language preference; and

- transmitting the converted content of the application from the server to the client.

[See col.11, line 65 – col.12, line 5 for the above features, wherein the transmitting step is an inherent to Furst's method]

Furst does not specifically teach downloading a component object from a selected one of the language pack software modules on the server to the client for converting supplemental content at the client; and retrieving supplemental content from the application for conversion on the client by the component object and processing by a client script.

However Begley teaches that a user may request reports containing data that is dynamically generated at request time [Abstract] and one way to generate the dynamic report is using ASP (Active Server Pages) engine by embedding special program codes in a HTML page, which is then rendered by the browser residing on a client computer [col.4, lines 3-20].

In view of the fact that Furst's could have requested a dynamically generated web page that needs to be translated into a preferred language, the generation of such page would therefore be converted at the server, leaving the dynamic portions (i.e., the supplemental content) to be processed (including translation of the relevant portions into the preferred language) via special program codes (i.e., a component object for additional translation and client script for dynamic processing) at the client side.

As such, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Furst and Begley by providing Begley's teaching about dynamic webpage rendering process as a supplemental processing step of Furst's language translation steps because (1) presenting dynamic web pages presented in various written languages is a popular trend and (2) by providing Furst's "real-time" translation is more efficient than pre-storing copies of translated webpages in a database.

Note that the additional steps depicted in claim 3 are considered obvious steps necessary to rendering a dynamic web page in a specified language.

7.   As to claims 4-7 and 9-10, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1, 3 and 5, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 5 above.

8.   Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furst [U.S. Pat. No. 6297819], as applied to claims 1, 3-7 and 9-10 above and Begley et

al.(hereafter "Begley")[U.S. Pat. No. 6360246], as applied to claims 1, 3-7 and 9-10

above, further in view of Official Notice.

9.   As to claim 2, Furst and Begley do not specifically teach transmission of

compressed component object.

        However Official Notice is taken that compressing a transmitted object over the

Internet is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to have applied appropriate compression

technique to Furst and Begley's component object because by doing so the

transmission time could be much reduced.

10.   As to claim 8, since the features of this claim can also be found in claims 1-2, 5

and 7, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-2, 5 and 7

above.

11.   A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three)

months and 0 days from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period

for response will result in ABANDONMENT of the application (see 35 U.S.C. 133,

M.P.E.P. 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-4875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00) .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)872-9306 for official communications; and

(703)746-5516 for status inquires draft communication.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Wen-Tai Lin

June 2, 2004